



## Minutes Parlier Local Advisory Group Meeting July 21, 2005

### **Local Advisory Group (LAG) members present:**

Jenna Ambacher, Teresa deAnda, Doug Edwards, Raul Gaona, Rey Leon, Harold McClarty, Richard Milton, Vernon Peterson, Martin Macareno, Daniela Simunovic, Lou Martinez. (*Absent:* Ben Benavidez, Weldon Byram, Luci Dominico, Dr. Rogelia Fernandez, Chris Haga, Israel Lara, Matthew Towers, and Richard Velasco.)

**Facilitator:** Lydia Martinez

**DPR staff:** Veda Federighi, Randy Segawa, Pat Matteson.

**Audience sign-in sheet:** Karri Hammerstrom, Roger Isom, Ofilia Figueroa, Carol Chandler, Manuel Cunha, Vianey Nunez, John Wood, Caroline Farrell, Steve Beckley, Barry Bedwell, Erin Field, Luis Cabrales, Bill Chandler.

**1. Introductions and review:** Lydia Martinez opened the meeting with introductions of LAG members and the audience. She then reviewed the meeting agenda and ground rules established at the first meeting and introduced the comment cards that the public would be asked to use. Veda Federighi responded to questions with assurances that everyone would be given the opportunity to be heard. While reviewing the June 9 minutes, Veda explained that DPR did not have the expertise to conduct a formal “comparative risk” analysis, but would put pesticide risk in perspective with other pollutants, in line with the LAG’s request.

**2. Selection of pesticides:** After a brief recap of the issues discussed at the previous meeting, Randy Segawa described the pesticides proposed for monitoring in Parlier, explaining trade or brand names, use patterns, health effects, volatility ratings, and risk assessment ratings. The groupings include pesticides that can be monitored in a single analysis, those grouped for volatility, and those that include metals. He asked the LAG members if they could add one more pesticide, would they choose chloropicrin or metam-sodium/MITC? Randy explained that the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) had a slight preference for chloropicrin but would agree with whatever the LAG decided. Following questions and discussion about the properties and uses of both pesticides, LAG members voted to include chloropicrin. A LAG member then asked if metam-sodium/MITC was more likely to be detected than chloropicrin. Randy’s affirmative response prompted the committee to vote again with the result that metam-sodium/MITC will be sampled instead. An audience member expressed concern that all pesticides to be monitored should be linked to their source and that a lack of funding was not an excuse to do an incomplete study.

**3. Sampling locations and frequency:** In response to initial suggestions from LAG members regarding placement of the equipment, Randy explained that any site would need to be secure



and have electricity, unobstructed air flow, and unrestricted access to DPR personnel. It would be more efficient to measure metals and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) on consecutive days. Martin Macareno asked about the difference between more sites and fewer days versus fewer sites and more days. Randy suggested two sites for more sampling days since Parlier is itself a small sampling area. Some disagreement ensued as members worried that people in the community would want their particular area monitored. Randy stated that there was more variability day to day than site to site. Veda gave an example of low pesticide days and high pesticide days in the same week and noted that only testing more days would provide such data. Randy explained wind flow in Parlier, including direction, time, and speed.

Discussion then occurred on the sites to be monitored. Veda commented that the emphasis of the project was on the population at greatest, not average, risk and children comprise that population. Benavidez Elementary School and Chavez Elementary School were suggested as sites, although Randy observed that both have trees and may not meet the criteria for testing sites. In response to concerns that the decision may already have been made, Veda assured the LAG that project decisions had not been made but when they were, LAG input would be seriously considered. The Technical Advisory Group is also informed about LAG comments and suggestions. Although DPR will make final project decisions because the project is DPR's responsibility and it is DPR that will be held accountable for its success, LAG will be informed about the rationale for the decisions made. In response to a question, Veda confirmed that monitoring would occur for a whole year.

**4. Confidentiality:** Randy asked about confidentiality of both the monitoring locations and the monitoring dates because of the potential concern for changes in pesticide use if people are aware of the schedule. Suggestions from LAG members ranged from no confidentiality about any aspect of the project to confidentiality about sampling dates to ensure that the normal spraying routines of farmers would continue to confidentiality as a precautionary principle. Some farmers present responded that pesticide applications are done when needed and when allowed and that farmers would not change their patterns because of the study. An audience member said that this kind of project information is generally considered a public record, that is, available to anyone who formally requests it. Randy and Veda responded that DPR doesn't usually publicize projects such as this but requests for information are always met and final results are always made known to the public.

**5. Future meeting schedule:** The LAG decided to retain its August 18 meeting day, since the Technical Advisory Group will be meeting in Parlier on the same day.

**The next meeting will be at 7 p.m., August 18, in the same place (Nectarine Room, Kearney Agricultural Center, Parlier.**